

REMARKS

The above Amendments and following remarks are responsive to all the points of objection and rejection raised by the Examiner in the Office Action dated August 5, 2003. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 2 and 7 have been canceled and claims 1, 3-6 and 8-16 are all the claims pending in the application. No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment. Entry and consideration of this Amendment are respectfully requested.

RESPONSE TO §102 REJECTION

In the Office Action, claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by French Patent No. 2,774,149 (hereafter the '149 patent). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on the '149 patent for disclosing all the limitations recited in claims 1-16. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the '149 patent does not appear to disclose all the elements recited in claims 1, 15 and 16. First, the '149 patent does not disclose "a first sector being adapted to generate images situated below the upper of two half planes delimiting a cut-off," as recited in claims 1, 15 and 16. Second, the '149 patent does not disclose "further sectors that are so arranged as to generate images of the light source all situated at heights in a range excluding heights above the limit of the lower of two half planes," as recited in claim 16.

The present invention as recited in claims 1, 15 and 16, is directed a headlamp for generating low beams which comply with U.S. regulations. This means that the cut-off line of the low beam is constituted by two half planes, which are horizontal and at different heights, therefore, improving the repartition of light at the limit of the cut-off, notably just

below the superior half plane. This is achieved by modifying the reflector so that it presents a sector specifically dedicated to bring more light at the limit of the upper of the two half planes. More specifically, a sector 40, obtained by rotation, brings back under the upper half plane some images from the light source that would otherwise have been above the cut-off. The light added at the limit of the upper half plane is not "taken away" from another zone below the cut-off, and does not modify the light repartition elsewhere below the cut-off. Additionally, the reflector is only very locally modified.

On the contrary, the '149 patent is directed to a headlamp for generating low beams which comply with European regulations. The cut-off line is constituted by two half planes: 1) one being horizontal; and 2) one making an angle of 15° with the horizontal plane (page 7, lines 20-23 and Figures 10 and 23).

More specifically, the headlamp of FR '149 includes a mirror with at least one region (Z) for generating images of the light source. The region (Z) is inclined so that it varies the images in a limited interval with respect to the horizontal. (See Abstract). However, as seen in Figs. 10 and 13, the images are not delimited so that they are situated between the horizontal line (H-h) and the cut-off line, as in the present invention. Additionally, there is neither description nor suggestion of a sector 40, as in the present invention.

It is also noted that the '149 patent is focused on using an "optical correcting system," that is able to position images along the oblique part of the cut-off line (of claim 1 of the '149), which does not apply in the framework of the invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that the difference in the shape of the cut-off lines according to U.S. and European regulations is not a minor one, and involves a quite different

approach.

Accordingly, claims 1, 15, and 16 are distinguishable over the '149 patent at least for the reasons noted above. Likewise, claims 3-6, and 8-14 are also believed to be distinguishable over the '149 patent because of their dependency from claim 1.

Claim 16, moreover, is distinguishable over the '149 patent for at least two other reasons. First, as mentioned previously the '149 patent does not appear to disclose "further sectors arranged so as to generate images of the light source all situated at heights in a range excluding heights above the limit of the lower of the two said half planes." Second, in the Office Action, the Examiner has neglected to point out with any kind of particularity what sections of the '149 patent are being relied on to reject all the limitations of claim 16.

Therefore, it is believed that claim 16 is distinguishable over the '149 patent for these reasons as well.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the above amendments and arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record, and are now in condition for allowance.


AUTHORIZATIONS

This paper is timely filed. Therefore, no fee is due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this filing to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1948-4766. Likewise, any overpayment is credited to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1948-4766.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Date: November 5, 2003

By:


Mark D. Pratt
Reg. No.:45,794
(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Morgan & Finnegan
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154